



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,098	01/14/2002	Andrew Lewis Schirmer	23452-502	6733

29315 7590 05/11/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/043,098

Applicant(s)

SCHIRMER ET AL.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' communication filed on 01/14/2002.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2172

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,169,986 issued to Bowman et al. (hereinafter Bowman) in view of US Patent No. 6,012,053 issued to Pant et al. (hereinafter Pant).

With respect to claim 1, Bowman teaches presenting a graphical user interface to a user (a graphical user interface presenting to users from which who can enter the search query and users enable to refine the search query: see fig. 2, col. 6, lines 7-30; also see col. 3, lines 52-60 and col. 4, lines 32-52 and abstract);

enabling a user to selectively input search parameters into a first search query using the graphical user interface (see fig. 2, the user is enabling to select the search parameters such as author, title, subject, ISBN), and date);

receiving the search query (see fig. 2, the search query is received via the entry box);

searching at least one database for objects that satisfy the search query (bibliographic database to be searched: col. 5, lines 40-52; also see col. 3, lines 15-22);

determining whether at least one object stored in the database satisfies the search query (see fig.2 and fig. 1, item 133, bibliographic database storing information of titles, authors, publishers, subjects description and ISBNs: col. 5, lines 40-52);

determining at least one search refinement option based on the type of information determined (refining search queries for reflecting the user's intended request: col. 4, lines 32-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6; also see col. 1, lines 35-67).

Bowman teaches a method or system of facilitating the refinement of search queries, receiving a search query from a user submitting via GUI as shown in fig. 2,

identifying the refined search queries (col. 3, lines 52-60), display the search result as shown in fig. 3, from GUL search screen, user is enabling to select or pick some search parameters such as titles, author, publisher or ISBN. Bowman does not clearly teaches parameters of the user input interface, retrieving a search result comprising the at least one object if a determination is made that the at least one object satisfies the search query, and determining a type of information included in the at least one object.

However, Pant teaches there are several parameters of the user input interface to vary the relevance factors from which the user may manipulate them (col. 8, lines 12-36), the search result from the searching or retrieving is provided to the user (see abstract, figs. 7-9, and col. 13, lines 8-32) and type of information is based on the selected object, see fig. 5, col. 8, lines 62-67 and col. 9, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bowman with the teachings of Pant so as to have a GUI from which the user being able to select the search parameters and type of information to be retrieved (see fig. 5 and fig. 6) and the search results are displayed to the user. The motivations are that the search query receiving from user of the system via GUI is refined depending to the user's intended request as well as the type of information to be searched from the database of the system.

With respect to claim 2, teaches the step of: presenting the at least one search refinement option to the user (the process of refining of the search query: see figs 2 and col. 3, lines 7-60, col. 4, lines 32-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6).

With respect to claim 3, teaches wherein the at least one search refinement option is presented in a drop-down menu (drop-down menu: see fig 8, col. 14, lines 2-8; also see Pant's figs 5 and 6, and item 322, col. 9, lines 8-16).

With respect to claim 4, teaches the step of enabling the user to select the at least one search refinement option (see fig. 2 and col.4, lines 32-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6; also col. 1, lines 35-67).

With respect to claim 5, teaches the step of enabling the user to input a second search query comprising the at least one search refinement option (a plurality of refined search queries, a search query refinement and a initializing refined search query: col. 3, lines 52-60).

With respect to claim 6, Teaches wherein the second search query searches the search result for objects that satisfy the second search query (see fig. 9 and col. 3, lines 52-60 and col. 14, lines 26-57).

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 13, Bowman teaches a presenting module that presents a graphical user interface to a user (a graphical user interface presenting to users from which who can enter the search query and users enable to refine the search query: see fig. 2, col. 6, lines 7-30; also see col. 3, lines 52-60 and col. 4, lines 32-52 and abstract);

a search parameter inputting module that enables a user to selectively input search parameters into a first search query using the graphical user interface (see fig. 2, the user is enabling to select the search parameters such as author, title, subject, ISBN), and date);

a receiving module that receives the search query (see fig. 2, the search query is received via the entry box);

a searching module that searches at least one database for objects that satisfy the search query (bibliographic database to be searched: col. 5, lines 40-52; also see col. 3, lines 15-22);

a search query module that determines whether at least one object stored in the database satisfies the search query (see fig.2 and fig. 1, item 133, bibliographic database storing information of titles, authors, publishers, subjects description and ISBNs: col. 5, lines 40-52);

a search query module that determines at least one search refinement option based on the type of information determined (refining search queries for reflecting the user's intended request: col. 4, lines 32-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6; also see col. 1, lines 35-67).

Bowman teaches a method or system of facilitating the refinement of search queries, receiving a search query from a user submitting via GUI as shown in fig. 2, identifying the refined search queries (col. 3, lines 52-60), display the search result as shown in fig. 3, from GUL search screen, user is enabling to select or pick some search parameters such as titles, author, publisher or ISBN. Bowman does not clearly teaches parameters of the user input interface, a retrieving modules that retrieves a search result comprising the at least one object if a determination is made that the at least one object satisfies the search query, and a search query module that determines a type of information included in the at least one object.

However, Pant teaches there are several parameters of the user input interface to vary the relevance factors from which the user may manipulate them (col. 8, lines 12-36), the search result from the searching or retrieving is provided to the user (see abstract, figs. 7-9 , and col. 13, lines 8-32) and type of information is based on the selected object, see fig. 5, col. 8, lines 62-67 and col. 9, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bowman with the teachings of Pant so as to have a GUI from which the user being able to select the search parameters and type of information to be retrieved (see fig. 5 and fig. 6) and the search results are displayed to the user. The motivations are that the search query receiving from user of the system via GUI is refined depending to the user's intended request as well as the type of information to be searched from the database of the system.

With respect to claim 14, teaches the step of: presenting the at least one search refinement option to the user (the process of refining of the search query: see figs 2 and col. 3, lines 7-60, col. 4, lines 32-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6).

With respect to claim 15, teaches wherein the at least one search refinement option is presented in a drop-down menu (drop-down menu: see fig 8, col. 14, lines 2-8; also see Pant's figs 5 and 6, and item 322, col. 9, lines 8-16).

With respect to claim 16, teaches the step of enabling the user to select the at least one search refinement option (see fig. 2 and col.4, lines 32-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6; also col. 1, lines 35-67).

With respect to claim 17, teaches the step of enabling the user to input a second search query comprising the at least one search refinement option (a plurality of refined search queries, a search query refinement and a initializing refined search query: col. 3, lines 52-60).

With respect to claim 18, Teaches wherein the second search query searches the search result for objects that satisfy the second search query (see fig. 9 and col. 3, lines 52-60 and col. 14, lines 26-57).

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a processor-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a processor-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a processor-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a processor-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a processor-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is 703 306-4527 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on 703 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 746-7239.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: Central Office (703) 872-9306 (Central Official Fax Number)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-6606 or 703 305-3900.

ANH LY 
MAY 5th, 2004


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER